

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/073,751	02/09/2002	Arjun Kar Roy	01CON211P	4492	
25700	7590 09/15/2003			·	
	& FARJAMI LLP	•	EXAMI	EXAMINER	
16148 SAND CANYON IRVINE, CA 92618			СНИ, С	CHU, CHRIS C	
			· ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2815		
			DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003	DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

; . A		W				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/073,751	KAR ROY ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Chris C. Chu	2815				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the c ver sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which il (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP				
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancelNOTE:	ing a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 - 18</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8.☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(ş)	-				
10. Other:		1/2				

EDDIE LEE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800 Spen

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On pages 7 and 9 of response, applicant argues "Tsunemitsu does not teach, disclose, or suggest a metal resistor situated between a first and a second intermetallic dielectric layer". This argument is not persuasive because Tsunemitsu clearly discloses in Fig. 2 and column 2, lines 25 ~ 54 a metal resistor (16) situated between a first (15) and a second (17) intermetallic dielectric layer. Further, Yaung et al. teaches in Fig. 4 a dielectric cap layer (30) situating between a metal resistor (26) and a second intermetallic dielectric layer (34). Thus, Tsunemitsu et al. and Yaung et al. disclose the invention as defined in the amended independent claim 10 and Tsunemitsu et al., Kumar and Yaung et al. disclose the invention as defined in the amended independent claim 1.